DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 771 JC 820 579

AUTHOR Hollingsworth, Patricia
TITLE An Investigation of Successful Approaches in Teaching Basic Skills for Program Development in the Community College.
PUB DATE 10 Dec 82
NOTE 84p.; Graduate seminar paper, Pepperdine University.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Basic Skills; Community Colleges; Cost Effectiveness; *Developmental Studies Programs; Instructional Development; Program Administration; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; *Remedial Instruction; *Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Los Angeles Community Colleges CA

ABSTRACT

Drawing from an extensive literature review and interviews with faculty and administrators in the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD), this study report examines successful practices in basic skills instruction in community colleges. After providing background on the importance of basic skills programs in light of the increasing number of underprepared community college students and on common criticisms of remedial programs, chapter 1 introduces the study's purposes and methods. Chapter 2 begins by highlighting effective instructional practices and methodologies for teaching basic skills as indicated by research and authorities in the field. It goes on to describe the characteristics of developmental programs at selected two- and four-year colleges that have been successful in enhancing student learning. Chapter 3 presents findings from the interviews with LACCD staff, providing summaries of successful experiences and programs at each college and reviewing districtwide activities. Chapter 4 offers conclusions and recommendations for planning, developing, administering, and operating an effective, efficient basic skills program. The described model has assessment and prescriptive components; includes writing, reading, mathematics, and English as a Second Language instruction; incorporates formative and summative evaluation procedures; and provides for access to all available instructional resources. The survey instrument and an extensive bibliography are included. (DAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226771

AN INVESTIGATION OF SUCCESSFUL APPROACHES IN TEACHING BASIC SKILLS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

In Partial Fulfillment of
Requirements for Education 706
Dr. B. Lamar Johnson

Patricia Hollingsworth
Pepperdine University
Los Angeles, California

December 10, 1982

JC 820 579

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Hollingsworth

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Problem and Purposes Importance of the Problem Method of Study Definition of Terms Scope and Limitations	
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16
	Identification of Instructional Practices and Methodologies for Teaching Basic Skills in the Community College Identification of Successful Program Characteristics in Basic Skills Programming in the Community College	
III.	FINDINGS	40
IV.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	54
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	59
	APPENDICES	64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since its inception, the doctrine of the community college has been to provide access to those seeking a higher education. In California, the "open door policy" is one of the notable characteristics of this institution. The principle allows anyone eighteen years or older entry. This concept is consistent with the ideal that American education has always been and will continue to be concerned with educating every citizen to the level of his/her highest potential.[1] College continues to be the path by which children of immigrants and the poor advance economically and socially.

Traditionally, the community college has served the needs of people who lacked necessary finance and educational background for success in the upper division, the four-year colleges. Thus, the need for intensive basic skills services for college students is not a recent phenomenon, but has deep historical roots.[2]

In 1852 Henry Tappan in his inaugural address as president of the University of Michigan stated that American colleges were too much involved in teaching rudimentary courses that belonged in intermediate or even primary schools. He also declared that universities were lowering their standards by admitting poorly prepared students.[3]

A century later, during the 1950s and early '60s many more Americans sought additional educational opportunities. Faced with more applicants than they wanted, colleges became more selective and, as Cross describes, this time was "the heyday of educational meritocracy."[4] Prospective students were required to take batteries of achievement and ability tests to determine which ones had the abilities and talents to succeed in college. Students who had learning or motivational problems were not high priorities. Such a process should have insured high student retention. It did not. No more than half of those freshmen admitted were graduated, and these students had no observable learning problems.[5]

> During the 1960s four complex and interrelated events were probably the most important--open admissions, federal policies mandated to increase access to higher education for educationally disadvantaged students and women, declining basic skills of college students, and grade inflation.[6]

In response to demand for demonstrated equal access, an effort to eliminate past discriminatory practices was the removal of all barriers to entry. Open admissions policies were adopted by most two-year colleges. The new students, high risk, with low incomes were academically underprepared for success in college courses.

Basic skills programs burgeoned as a result of the need to remediate skills deficiencies. Each institution developed its own strategy for dealing with its low achieving enrollees. A wealth of variation in methodology ensued along with the increase in the number of programs, courses and

departments. Roueche found in 1977 that 93 percent of community colleges provided remediation, which was an overall increase from 1973 of more than 35 percent. Says Roueche, the continued growth of these services and programs generally speaks well for both the institutional and federal commitment to provide access and opportunity to the non-traditional student.[7]

It is important for the community college to not only admit and retain these students but to also insure that by special services and basic skills programs students will achieve success as demonstrated by completion of a desired technical/occupational program and/or transfer to a four-year college.

This paper will focus on basic skills programs in community colleges which have been developed in response to the needs of millions of students. In most community colleges the majority of the student population needs basic skills courses, which are mandatory for continued academic achievement, lifelong learning, and success in life.

Problem and Purposes

> The same democratic ideal that fosters notions of a nation of intelligent voters abhors any concept of an aristocracy. A problem that accompanies the technical and scientific wonders of today and tomorrow is how to avoid a two-class society: those who can invent, maintain, manage and use the technology, and those who cannot grasp its workings or uses, and, therefore, benefit less. This is clearly a dangerous possibility that is upon us and can easily produce a society of those in control and those controlled.

> Connected to these concerns is the uneasy feeling that every person who fails to gain the basic skills for meaningful participation in the development and understanding of new ideas is a lost, possibly valuable resource.[8]

Because elementary and secondary schools have failed to educate their population, higher education has had to cope with increasing numbers of underprepared students. Says Robert McCabe, President, Miami-Dade Community College, "The literary gap is a national crisis serious enough to destroy the country."[9]

In a 1979 Report of the New Jersey Basic Skills Council, Edge translated the test results of 47,725 students entering higher education in the fall of 1979. Performance was categorized into one of three groups: appears proficient in basic skills tested; demonstrates proficiency in some areas tested; and demonstrates a lack of proficiency serious enough to indicate a clear need for remediation. Data were presented for the total state and types of institutions (two-year colleges, state colleges, New Jersey Institute of Technology, and Rutgers University) for the following tests: reading comprehension, sentence structure, logical relationships, essay, composition, total English, computation and elementary algebra. Three conclusions were reached: a substantial proportion of New Jersey students entering college are not proficient in the basic verbal and mathematical skills necessary to perform college-level work; deficiencies are present at both two-year and four-year institutions; and the level of proficiency required to complete three years of

high school instruction in English and mathematics is considerably lower than the proficiency expected of entering freshmen.[10]

As a result, community colleges have been forced into the task of remediating a large percentage of their students. Whether one calls it "remediation," "basic skills instruction," "learning assistance," "developmental education," or "compensatory education," the topic of overcoming student underpreparation for college has attracted the concern of educators and the public throughout the country. Although debate continues over definition of terms as well as approaches to the problem, one fact is clear: an alarming number of students entering colleges and universities today lack adequate skills in reading, writing and mathematics.[11]

Critics attack remedial programs, stating that basic skills courses do little to increase the retention of underprepared students. They criticize unclear goals and objectives and vague organizational structure. Many programs are fragmented and classified as special or supportive. They often operate in a climate of hostility or indifference by the academic departments. College administrators generally do not consider remedial instruction an effective way to use faculty resources. Faculty members are rarely experienced, skilled, or interested in teaching remedial students.

Says Maxwell, college remedial reading courses are not designed to fill information gaps or to help students gain quickly the cognitive skills that must develop slowly

with extensive practice.[12] Researchers have also found that extensive basic skills programs can be very expensive to maintain. CUNY spends $35 million yearly on remediation.[13] Since Proposition 13, state funding for California's community colleges has eroded,[14] yet the cost of remediation for the California community colleges in 1980-81 was $66 million with the state serving as major contributor with 93 percent of that amount.[15]

> Prompted both by educational concern and fiscal constraints, questions about remedial activities have multiplied in California as elsewhere. Is remediation an appropriate function for colleges and universities? If appropriate, how much of it is affordable? What impact is it having on students and institutions? How much does it cost, and can its cost be reduced? And how can California keep its promise of higher education for all able young people when many able youth are unprepared for college?[16]

Budget reductions and public demand for accountability should cause institutions to re-evaluate and possibly revamp existing basic skills programs. They have continued to expand while coordination has diminished. Although instructional successes have been identified, reports of success and failure continue to be inconsistent.[17]

Often programs have effective components; still, their total impact on a college or district could be intensified. In a report titled "Strengthening Developmental Skills in the Los Angeles Community College District," November 1981, listed under districtwide problems and needs were the following: assessment/course advisement, staff develoment, tutorial programs, program coordination, and program evaluation.

The report further stated that "although the district's nine colleges have instituted effective programs and/or courses, these basic skills efforts are not without problems."[18] Nonetheless, these efforts have been established to meet existing critical needs. Says Maxwell, "I believe that instruction and programs for the poorly prepared student need not be so costly and ineffective."[19]

This study proposes to examine successful practices in teaching basic skills for improved program development in the community college. More specifically, it is the purpose of this study to:

1. Identify effective instructional practices and methodologies for teaching basic skills.
2. Identify successful program characteristics in teaching basic skills at specific community colleges.
3. On the basis of the findings of 1. and 2., make recommendations for planning, developing and operating an effective, efficient "success model" community college program for teaching basic skills.

Importance of the Problem

The continued expansion of basic skills in the community college is a critical issue. The reality is that if we eliminate it, we will eliminate a vast number of our students, for more than 45 percent of community college students

enroll in remedial reading and writing courses.[20] Fifty-seven percent enroll in remedial math.[21] Without these demonstrable skills, success in technical programs and transferable coursework will be greatly diminished. Students will enter through an "open door" and quickly exit from a "revolving door."[22]

The Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, The California State University and Colleges, and the University of California (1981) prepared Statements on Preparation in English Math and declared "underpreparation of entering students in California colleges and universities is a widespread and serious problem."[23] Other documents published by the State of California stress the concern for basic skills.

> The course of study for community colleges is provided by state legislation and includes what has been termed basic skills instruction. Section 78201 of the California Education Code states: The course of study for two-year community colleges shall be designed to fit the needs of students of the 13th and 14th grades and may include courses of instruction designed to prepare for admission to the upper division of higher institutions of learning and such other courses of instruction designed to prepare persons for agriculture, commercial, homemaking, industrial and other vocations, and such courses of instruction as may be deemed necessary to provide for the civic and liberal education of the citizens of the community.
>
> In consonance with the above legislation, Section 51101 of the California Administrative Code, Title 5, simply states, 'Each community college shall establish such programs of education and courses as will permit the realization of the objectives and functions of the community college.
>
> The Board of Governors in several position statements has affirmed its support of basic skills

> instruction. For example, in its Five Year Plan, adopted in January 1977, the Board lists "developmental education" as one of the five areas in which community colleges should have curriculum offerings. In that connection the plan states, "community colleges have long recognized their responsibility to offer basic developmental or remedial programs.[24]

In its Report to the Chancellor of California Community Colleges (October 1979), the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Basic Skills

> felt strongly that basic skills instruction must be placed among the highest priorities in the institution. In a time of financial restrictions and demand for accountability, it is essential that the general public understand the importance of basic skills in the comprehensive community college. The Board of Governors has maintained a broad mission for community colleges--to provide general, transfer, occupational, developmental and community education. It is the position of the Advisory Committee on Basic Skills that basic skills provide a firm foundation for all other areas in community college education.[25]

The California Post Secondary Commission reported in its September 1982 draft report "Promises To Keep--Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities" that

> among nine priorities it identified for action by the post secondary community over the next five years, the improvement of student preparation and skills ranks in the top two. In its five-year plan, The Challenges Ahead: A Planning Agenda for California Postsecondary Education, 1982-87, the commission committed itself to providing information on the remedial education activities of the three public segments of higher education and to working with the leaders of secondary education and the postsecondary segments to improve the preparation and subsequent performance of students (1981, pp. 16-17).[26]

Dr. Leslie Koltai, Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District, reported in his 1982 State of

the District Address that

> if a measure of success is the persistence of students to sophomore standing, only 16 percent of this district's Fall 1982 students were sophomores--that is, with 30 to 60 units. This proportion is down from 23 percent in 1973.
>
> The number of degrees and certificates awarded has also dropped from 9,233 in 1972-73 to 7,645 in 1981-82. We have a tremendous amount of homework to do in this regard.
>
> We can assume that access can be improved if we confront the student with clear expectations of defined priorities, of prerequisites for sequential enrollment, and of academic standards.
>
> In other words, we need to work together to prepare ourselves for teaching more effectively the multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-lingual student mix present in our classroom today. We need to work on classroom management, on how to give and trade essays, on how to teach and take stress in a heterogenous environment, realizing that--for some of us--academic background in letters and sciences did not provide heavy emphasis on selection of appropriate instructional methodology.
>
> We need to get involved in updating our teaching skills--particularly in the areas of composition, English as a Second Language, and mathematics, as well as in data interpretation and the use of computers in the instructional arena.[27]

Method of Study

In carrying out this study, the following methods will be used:

1. A review of the literature will be employed.

2. A computer search by ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges will be used to identify successful practices in teaching basic skills in the community colleges

3. Interviews will be conducted with faculty and administrators who are responsible for the successful operations of basic skills in the Los Angeles Community College District.

4. Statewide Reports on Basic Skills and Los Angeles Community College District Reports will be reviewed.

The findings of this study will focus on successful practices for efficient program development.

These practices will be termed successful because they effect increased student learning, retention, program completion and transfer.

Definition of Terms

Basic Skills are those fundamental or essential academic skills which are necessary to function in today's complex world and which are also necessary for student success in academic and/or vocational programs in the community college. Basic Skills refer to the reading, writing, computational, speech and listening skills that should have been mastered in elementary school. Basic Skills are also described as those skills and knowledge acquired in high school.

Competency Based Education is that instruction which is designed to teach and test a specific skill and/or ability.

Developmental Education is that instruction which gives attention to the development of academic and personal skills necessary for achievement.

Disadvantaged Student is a student whose past educational experience and economic background handicap success in postsecondary education.

High Risk Student - Students who have discernible deficiencies in reading, writing and arithmetic are described by this term.

Mainstreaming is the directed flow of students who have successfully completed remediation into regular college programs of study.

Non-traditional Students are those students who are new and unacquainted with the college environment.

Remedial is a term used specifically to distinguish such work from work acceptable for the baccalaureate degree.

Remediation aims to overcome academic deficiencies.

Scope and Limitations

The findings of this study are applicable to community colleges which have a large percentage of academically underprepared enrollees. The topic is important to all community college faculty and administrators who look for successful basic skills practices to improve the academic proficiency of students. Successful basic skills practices on nine campuses of the Los Angeles Community College District will be studied. Interviews will be conducted with key personnel.

This study will be limited to the area of basic skills, those academic skills that include reading, writing,

English as a second language (ESL) and mathematics. There will be no indepth discussion of developmental education, although reference is made to it because some basic skills programs are part of a developmental skills program or department. The study will be confined to a review of selected basic skills practices in community/junior colleges in the United States. The ERIC computer search will help to highlight programs between the years 1977 through 1981 which are reported to be successful.

Chapter I Footnotes

[1]B. Lamar Johnson, Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1964), p. 40.

[2]Martha Maxwell, Improving Student Learning Skills (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979), p. 6.

[3]Ibid., p. 7.

[4]Patricia Cross, Accent on Learning: Improving Instruction and Reshaping the Curriculum (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), p. 26.

[5]John E. Roueche and Jerry J. Snow, Overcoming Learning Problems (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), p. 7.

[6]Maxwell, p. 12.

[7]Roueche and Snow, pp. 19-20.

[8]Roger Yarrington, "Literacy in Community Colleges Overview," ERIC Junior College Resource Review (Spring 1982):2.

[9]Robert H. McCabe, "Excellence Is for Everyone," speech presented at the Workshop, Transfer, Honors, and Excellence, Los Angeles Harbor College, Wilmington, California 90744, October 28, 1982.

[10]Donald Edge, Report of the New Jersey Basic Skills Council (Trenton, New Jersey: ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 185098, 1979).

[11]California Postsecondary Education Commission, Promises to Keep Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities September Draft, 1982, V.

[12]Maxwell, pp. 22-24.

[13]Alice Stewart Trillin and Associates, Teaching Basic Skills in College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 262.

[14]Martha F. Wengert, "An Investigation of Developmental Education," unpublished paper in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for Education 706, Pepperdine University (December 4, 1981), 49.

[15]California Postsecondary Education Commission, Promises to Keep, p. 103.

[16]Ibid., V.

[17]Roueche and Snow, p. 38.

[18]Kathryn Akers, "Strengthening Developmental Skills in the Los Angeles Community College District," Division of Educational Services (November 1981):27.

[19]Maxwell, p. X.

[20]California Postsecondary Education Commission, Promises to Keep, p. 82.

[21]Ibid., p. 90.

[22]Maxwell, p. 7.

[23]"The Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University and Colleges, and the University of California, Statements on Preparation in English and Mathematics--Competencies Expected of Entering Freshmen Remedial and Baccalaureate-Level Coursework Admission Requirements," Academic Council (November 18, 1981):3.

[24]Clarence Mangham, Basic Skills Study Report, Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (October 26, 1979), 6.

[25]Ibid., p. 7.

[26]California Postsecondary Education Commission, Promises to Keep, V.

[27]Dr. Leslie Koltai, Chancellor, Los Angeles Community College District, "State of the District Address," presented November 3, 1982, District Administrative Office, Los Angeles, California.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There exists a voluminous collection of literature in the areas of basic skills, remediation, and developmental education. The relevant literature decreases quantitatively when the subject is limited to successful programs in teaching basic skills.

It would be virtually impossible to identify one community/junior college which has an ideal basic skills program, although a number have excelled in specific areas, either in reading, writing, ESL or math. Each institution has used some form of evaluation process to determine success.

The first section is an identification of effective instructional practices and methodologies for teaching basic skills as indicated by research and identified by authorities in the field.

The second section discusses successful program characteristics in basic skills development at selected community and four-year colleges throughout the nation. Although the colleges were identified as being successful as a result of an ERIC computer search, those which indicated instructional improvement by means of increased student learning and success are described in this study.

Trillin determined that although we have come a long way in articulating programs, in defining objectives and in refining teaching strategies, we have just begun to do the kind of solid research essential to the development of skills programs.[1]

Fundamental to the structure of a basic skills program are the following components: assessment and diagnosis of deficiencies, writing, reading, English as a second language (ESL), math and program evaluation. These areas comprise the skeleton on which additions such as advisement, counseling, financial aid, career planning, job placement, tutoring, Learning Resource Center services and integrative approaches to more advanced coursework may be appendaged. Wiuhout maximum coordination between all the components, a sound program structure cannot exist.

Community colleges differ in their procedures to determine which students register for basic skills. Courses may be credit or noncredit. Enrollment may be required or voluntary, and is based on some form of assessment and diagnosis of students' academic weaknesses. Research has shown that mandatory assessment and placement is more manageable and desirable by faculty and administration.[2] Cut-off scores on a college's placement test determine a student's enrollment in a designated basic skills curriculum which corresponds to the score. A nationally normed standardized test such as the ACT, the test of the American College Testing Program, may be used.[3] Once placement is determined, criterion referenced

standardized instruments are utilized as diagnostic tools. They include the Stanford TASK, Test of Academic Skills, Level II, the Cooperative English Test or the Gates MacGinitie Test in reading comprehension and vocabulary.[4] The English or grammar sections may be used from the Stanford TASK or the Cooperative English Test, along with a holistically scored writing sample as a diagnostic instrument in writing. Because ESL learning includes speaking and listening along with reading and writing, oral and listening tests are required in addition to reading and writing exams.[5] In math, students' computational difficulties may be diagnosed by using the Stanford TASK mathematics test.

Loomis reports in part of a series on implementary competency-based education some diagnostic and prescriptive techniques which can be used in the daily management of performance learning. Formal measurements such as Canfield and Lafferty's Learning Style Inventory, Cloze procedure, SMOG assessment of reading level, math and communication tests and professional opinions are included. Along with the administration of test instruments, the monograph recommends the use of instructional modules, optional learning experiences, peer tutors, and reward systems to encourage the development of problem-solving skills.[6]

As a supplement to the Los Rios Community College District Masterplan, Hendrick provides a model for student diagnosis within the district's instructional programs. The report first identifies three areas for diagnosis: determination

of the remedial instruction needed by students, identification of their preferred learning styles, and survey of their aptitudes and educational objectives. Seven recommendations for the implementation and integration of the diagnostic model within instructional programs are then provided: establish a formalized diagnostic program; encourage all full-time students to undergo diagnosis and enter the instructional program at the educational skill level most appropriate to their current abilities; develop a "pre-college" curriculum to improve learning skills; establish and articulate minimum learning skills levels for each course offered; provide cumulative conceptual levels of instruction for all introductory general education courses; use competency-based instruction where appropriate; and promote the further use of self-paced, open entry/open exit, computer-assisted instruction.[7]

Once assessment, placement into the basic skills area of need, and diagnosis of skills deficiencies are completed, instruction to remediate specific skills can begin by using successful teaching methodologies. In each of the academic areas courses are arranged in a sequential order and skills are remediated in a hierarchical order of complexity and abstraction. In reading and writing there are usually three levels of remediation--beginning, intermediate, and advanced.

Good writing requires practice and adequate feedback. A number of successful strategies have been listed by Maxwell, Gray and Shaunessy. They are: free writing, pre-writing

small group editing and drawing topics from the student's area of specialization. Other departments submit suggestions to writing instructors for improved writing in a particular technical field or academic subject. This is known as writing across the curriculum. Integrative, interdisciplinary team teaching is recommended.[8] The above techniques improve conventional modes of expository writing--description, narration, analysis and argumentation.[9]

Other techniques are used to improve word and sentence skills. They are: structural analysis of words, a related concept approach to teaching spelling and vocabulary, sentence combining, sector analysis, and controlled composition.[10] The college student with minimal writing skills and little previous exposure to reading books has been called the basic writing student.[11] Many college students who do not have severe grammatical or other basic writing problems do have difficulty with academic writing assignments and can benefit from these techniques.

As in writing, there is a list of practices which reading instructors should utilize for their students' success. So many instructional methods have been tried, and many succeed, so further changes in methodology are unlikely to produce great reading gains. But, greater understanding by the instructor of the reading process will help the instructor to choose those methodologies most appropriate to the needs of individual students.[12] Curriculum to improve

reading is divided into three skills areas: word skills, comprehension skills and study skills.

For teaching word skills, stress is placed on decoding, structural analysis, vocabulary, signal words and context clues.

Improving comprehension requires students' understanding of connected discourse. Specifically, the curriculum concentrates on paragraph structure--topic, main idea both stated and implied, and variations of supporting details. Included is critical reading.

Snouffer, Kendall, and Thistlethwaite studied the effects of the structured overview and vocabulary pre-teaching upon reading comprehension levels of college freshmen who read physical science and history materials. Literal (lower level) and inferential/evaluative (upper level) comprehension was studied. Groups of students were assigned three different treatments: structured overview pre-reading activity, vocabulary pre-reading activity and no pre-reading activity. Posttest analysis showed that the structured overview groups had significantly higher total comprehension than the vocabulary control groups. The structured overview treatment also improved students' literal and inferential comprehension scores. The vocabulary activity seemed to be more important in the teaching of science than in the teaching of history, perhaps because science is based so largely upon mastery of terminology. Regardless of the difficulty of the material,

the structured overview was clearly an effective teaching stragegy.[13]

Study skills improvement is determined by attention to outlining, notetaking, study strategies, flexibility in reading rate and library research. Orlando relates the benefits of a modified version of the SQ3R (survey, question, read, recite, and review) study technique and tells how the modified version emphasizes previewing, reading, reciting, reviewing, and checking notes. He describes a strategy for training students to use the technique while providing guidance in applying it.

English as a second language is an area in basic skills instruction which incorporates the previously listed successful content in writing and reading and also uses techniques for improvement in speaking and listening. Dictation, dicto-comp, oral presentations, and small group discussion are essential for improvement in this area.[15] Audio-visual and interactive lab equipment are key to the success of an ESL program.

Reading and what is necessary for writing improvement, namely the ability to think abstractly and analytically, and to reason logically and deductively are essential for the development of mathematical skills. Also important is the ability to translate words into mathematical symbols, to manipulate these symbols to solve word problems and to be able to integrate this information and apply it to practical solutions.[16] Content for remedial math includes arithmetic,

elementary and intermediate alebra, Euclidean and analytic geometry, logarithms, trigonometry and pre-calculus. This is considered a traditional precollege mathematics curriculum. The methods used include lecture-demonstration, tutoring, and self-paced instructional programs.

Says McDonald and Cotroneo, developmental educators cannot achieve positive results through manipulating only external variables in the teaching-learning process using various instructional styles and methods. They must consider thinking skills. Thinking skills include basic analytical reasoning and higher order intellectual processes such as interpretation and application. Instructors should evaluate students' thinking skills and devote class time to improving reasoning.[17]

All basic skills areas must clearly state their course objectives and curriculum and instructional goals should mirror them. Methodology, although previously listed in one area, may be applicable to several, if not all.

Math programs in two-year colleges show the broadest interest in materials. They use slides, audio tapes, self-contained modules, demonstration models and programmed instruction.[18] But all of the areas are strengthened by support from a learning resource center which is well staffed with tutors and teaching assistants, and contains a well equipped laboratory for each basic skill component, and a computer assisted instruction facility with appropriate software, a modern library and a media services component.

In each of the areas author-educators have presented curricula and instructional characteristics and practices which they report to be pertinent for success. Methods of program evaluation may include the determination of increased student retention, specifically longer enrollment and lower dropout rates and increased numbers of students being mainstreamed into standard coursework. Additionally, it is important to compute the increases in student program completions and transfers. Other methods of evaluation include the use of standardized norm and/or criterion referenced test instruments. Given as posttests, student learning of skills is measured. Both formative and summative methods of evaluation are important for program improvement and determining college wide impact. Studies have shown that inhouse evaluators are usually biased by success and an outside evaluator encourages a nonprejudicial approach.[19] In addition, Wengert found the following variables ranked significantly in the literature as being measures which contribute to the evaluation of a successful program:

1. higher grade point average
2. higher student achievement in English
3. higher student achievement in reading
4. higher student achievement in math
5. gains on standardized tests
6. higher levels of academic performance
7. greater rate of graduation
8. college appropriate study habits
9. more positive attitudes toward subject matter.
10. Developmental students completed more courses than non-developmental students.[20]

Wengert also found twenty-three separate developmental programs which were classified by common characteristics

considered successful by their program evaluators. The practices identified with success are:

1. early identification of students with deficiencies
2. mandatory assessment
3. required enrollment in remediation courses
4. students receive statements of learning/course objectives
5. content based instruction
6. interdisciplinary courses
7. diversity of instructional techniques
8. special instructional help available
9. student feedback on progress
10. non-punitive learning atmosphere
11. open-entry/open-exit classes
12. tutoring
13. counseling attached to instruction
14. third party (outside) evaluation[21]

Rippey, in an article entitled "I Never Get No Respect . . . Or Support Either," discusses productive options that developmental studies staffs can take in programs including how to win faculty support from other departments, and strengthen the flow of information to other faculty and administrators to build administrative trust. He stresses the fact that administrators need concrete evidence that programs benefit students and the college.[22]

Successful basic skills practices in selected two- and four-year colleges have been recognized in the literature.

At Los Angeles Southwest College students in basic skills are required to enroll in classes taken concurrently and that involve a total language approach--reading, writing, speaking, listening. Students are also required to attend the Learning Resource Center. The organization of its basic skills program lends itself to a pretest/posttest evaluative design. The Nelson Reading test is used to determine reading levels.

Faculty determined that a retention rate of 80 percent and an improvement in reading levels of 1.4 to 2.3 grade equivalents during one semester were indicators of success. As a result, in reading they were able to meet the departmental goals, which are (1) a 70 percent retention rate; (2) two-year improvement in reading scores each semester; (3) a five point improvement in math scores; and (4) improvement in writing samples that qualify for the next level of instruction. Faculty who conducted the research and evaluation point out that all goals are specific enough to be quantifiable and measurable. They state that the instructional environment must be one in which faculty are well trained and believe in the educability of non-traditional students. Instructors should work in close proximity to maximize interaction, share materials and methodology. Ruby Wallace and colleagues recognize that one need not scrap traditional teaching methods in order to be successful. They can serve to complement new modes. Required also are showing a genuine concern for students, instructor availability, course uniformity, student adherence to firm deadlines, and accurate attendance records for class and lab attendance.[23]

The Writing Program Assessment Project at the University of Texas at Austin began in 1980 in response to public concern about the literacy crisis of the 1970s. In spite of increasing emphasis upon evaluation, that for writing programs remains rudimentary, with little concern for theoretical or methodological soundness. "On-site" assessments by

visiting experts and empirical evaluations of outcomes using a pretest-posttest design were not sufficient. The authors felt a more valid approach should emphasize the dynamic nature of writing programs taking into account the processes of writing, writer-reader interactions and the human relationships particular to any program. Five major components and the interactions among them were examined. The components are: cultural and social context, institutional context, program structure and administration, curriculum and instruction.[24]

In the area of English as a second language program development, the City University of New York (CUNY) is using new and effective approaches. Whether instruction assumes a grammatical or notional/functional mode, two approaches, the silent way and counseling-learning and community language learning are ways in which ESL students are viewed as whole selves with cognitive powers more extensive and complex than previously known, with feelings and attitudes more pivotal to learning ability than previously admitted, with lives and histories that bear heavily upon everything going on at any moment in the classroom. Both methods fall under this whole-person approach to learning.

Five colleges in CUNY use the silent way. Used mostly in lower levels of ESL, it focuses on students doing 90 percent of the speaking. Laguardia Community College is using a counseling-learning approach. Theoretically, it suggests that students view themselves as the center of their

own universe, resistant to outside influence unless that influence can be seen as trustworthy and nonthreatening. A learner does not simply add knowledge or skills to a stable core of himself but invests his whole self, consciously or unconsciously, into learning. Counseling learning aims toward an understanding of the dynamics of that investment and uses both positive and negative attitudes constructively.[25]

To overcome math anxiety and math avoidance, Wesleyan College established a math anxiety clinic to offer supportive workshop classes, a psychology lab and individual counseling.[26]

The self-paced pre-calculus course at the University of California at Berkeley has been helpful to students with very weak mathematical skills and those fearful of math. Instructor assistance and tutors are available. Students are encouraged to work in pairs or small groups.[27]

The minority engineers program at Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, New Jersey, handles academically weak students in a more traditional way. It is called "extra class option." Students must attend additional lectures and guided study sessions. They can review the week's lecture in math and receive assistance in problem solving.[28]

The University of Wisconsin at Eau Claire has attempted to solve the problem of underprepared freshmen by offering adjunct classes to freshman level content courses in seven departments. Their purposes are to teach and integrate learning and study skills necessary for success in the regular course content. Two extra class sessions per week are required

of students in the adjunct courses. They are usually team taught by two instructors, the department instructor who normally teaches the course and a basic skills instructor from reading and/or writing or math, depending on the requirements of the course. Academic support services are also offered at the academic skills center, and there is a special advisory component for disadvantaged students.[29]

Similarly, at the University of California, Riverside, a structured, formal adjunct program coordinated with large introductory courses has been developed to improve students' reading and study skills. The program uses basic skills instructor specialists who are familiar with the content areas. Skills taught include time management, efficient textbook reading, note taking from texts and lectures, and test reviewing and taking. Moran reported that during the 1978-1979 academic year, adjunct courses were taken by 496 students in biology, black studies, Chicano studies, history, political science, psychology, and sociology. Chemistry and religious studies adjunct were requested for the 1979-80 school year. Evaluations from faculty and students indicate that the program was effective in improving study skills, grade performance, and academic progress during the quarter.[30]

As reviewed, there are college practices in each of the basic skills areas throughout the country which are performing successfully. Surrounding subject area practices is the need for maximum coordination, proper assessment, placement, diagnosis and program evaluation. A further review

studied selected colleges which have coordinated previously described instructional practices and program characteristics into successful programs for basic skills development.

At Miami-Dade Community College in Florida, it is important that students be able to read, write and compute competently. The college states that "the mastery of communication and computational skills is essential in a quality education." It has adopted general education goals that focus on the development of the total person. The impact and importance of basic skills has not been overlooked, and their effect on the individual's total educational development has not been underestimated. All students who have completed three courses must take exams in math and English to determine their proficiency. Test results determine subsequent placement into support courses, the general education core, or specialized classes. A massive general education student advisement system for the 39,000 students enrolled is in operation. A computerized academic alert system monitors student progress by checking course attendance and completion, then sending individual midterm progress reports to each student. An advisement and graduation information system (AGIS) provides additional data and matches all students with their degree aspirations and informs them of their academic progress. In addition, a Standards of Academic Progress model warns students if they are failing to make satisfactory progress toward completing a program. It places them on suspension

if they do not reduce their load and take advantage of available help.[31]

Taking a similar approach, Passaic Community College, New Jersey, tests all entering students in reading, writing, speech and math. Students who lack proficiency in any of these areas are placed in a sequence of precollege courses.[32]

The concept of mastery learning was instituted at the City Colleges of Chicago because student achievement in remedial courses did not result in increased student retention or improved performance in regular coursework.[33]

The Alternative Services to Raise Achievement (ASTRA) program at the Greater Hartford (Connecticut) Community College is designed to supply developmental and other services to students with academic potential who are in need of such services to complete their education. The program's structure is intended to meet the diverse needs of students. The program is divided into five phases. In the first, students are identified, tested, and selected for the program. Phase two provides an intense intructional program in developmental communication skills. Phase three provides an interdisciplinary coordination of these skills with a content area course. In phase four, a three-week period of study is provided for those students who require additional time to succeed. The final phase of the program is the tracking phase in which counselors monitor students' progress in their regular academic work through weekly seminars. There are two teams

involved in the program, one for English speaking students and a second for bilingual students.[34]

The Los Rios Community College District Master Plan 1980 recommended educational diagnosis of entering freshmen to assess potential for academic success by (1) assessment of past academic and work experience, basic skills, preferred learning styles and individual interests; (2) the determination of personnel and budgetary needs for such a program; (3) the formation of a district task force to coordinate campus diagnostic programs; and (4) the use of counselors and academic advisers. The anticipated beneficial effects are student retention, curriculum development, and student academic achievement.[35]

An impact study on post-secondary developmental studies programs for occupational students was conducted by the Cornell Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education, State University of New York, Ithaca. It sought to identify the contributing independent variables (cognitive, affective, programmatic and environmental) which contribute to student success. A step-wise multiple regression was employed. Sources of data collected for those variables were grade point average and standardized reading scores. This study focused on the factors that were positive contributors to the success of two-year college students at six colleges who were enrolled in a basic skills development program. The results showed that affective/cognitive factors associated with students were determined to be more significant than environmental and background characteristics.[36]

The effects of the Basic Skills Programs on the scholastic performance of a selected group of low-achieving students enrolled at Bucks County Community College were investigated during the 1973-74 academic year. Students included in the study ranked in the bottom 40 percent of their high school graduating class and scored at the 25th percentile or below on the Comparative Guidance and Placement Test. This study contrasts 86 students participating in the Basic Studies Program (experimental group) with 97 non-participants (control group). The average grade point average (GPA) earned by the experimental group was 2.285, while the control group earned an average GPA of 1.77, a difference which was statistically significant. While 75 (87 percent) of the experimental group participants returned to Bucks for the fall 1974 semester, only 59 (61 percent) of the control group returned. The experimental group also proved to be more successful in English Composition and mathematics than the control group. They more frequently earned grades of "C" or better, and showed more persistence.[37]

Fadale and Winter investigated the impact of basic skill development programs on student success in career programs. A questionnaire packet was distributed to 61 two-year institutions which offer occupational courses in New York State. Six survey sites were selected from the data. Success was defined as eligibility to continue in a program and the development of the habit which was termed continuing to try. Successful students valued goal orientation and

recognition more highly than non-successful students. Student commitment also emerged as significant. Successful students exhibited firm career goals. Achievement, decisiveness, and orderliness were also key. The skills that constitute reading, writing and studying were perceived as most valuable by students. Math was valued, especially when it was central to the desired career program. It was evident from the data that for non-traditional students, testing and individual diagnosis/prescription play a major role in instruction. Also listed were four broad instructional approaches: block scheduling, learning/skill centers, designated courses and integrated teaching.[38]

The Student Advancement in Learning (SAIL) Project was instituted at Northwest Alabama State Junior College (NASJC) to increase the retention of high risk students through a combination of courses and services in the areas of academic and personal development, career exploration, individual counseling, and financial aid. The following steps were performed during the planning stages of the project: The literature dealing with the application of learning theories and testing instruments in programs designed to aid underprepared students was reviewed; the strengths and weaknesses of NASJC's current developmental services were examined; and an improved program was designed within the limits of a $50,000 grant. Objectives for each of the program's areas were then established, focusing on the improvement of basic skills through existing courses. SAIL's implementation

involved a pilot project and the gradual integration of SAIL's courses and services into the college's programs.[39]

As the second assessment study of developmental education programs at state-assisted higher education institutions, this 1978 study prepared for the Ohio Statewide Advisory Committee on Developmental Education reviews reports from 27 of 57 programs receiving funds from the Ohio Legislature. Results dealing with attitudes and opinions were strongly positive, the report says, probably due to significant improvements in basic skills. Several colleges reported modifying their programs according to student reaction and had better outcomes after making changes. The reports investigated student improvement in English and/or reading and math. Math and reading skill improvements were significant for each program. Reports classified as follow-up studies indicated that students who had participated in developmental programs tended to do well once enrolled in regular courses. They compared favorably in retention with regular students, and adjusted more easily to regular courses than non-developmental students.[40]

Hawaii's Community Colleges published a position paper entitled "Directions for the '80s." Out of the successes and unmet needs of the 1970s and based upon assumptions about future changes and constraints, the community colleges specified 11 directions for the 1980s. With regard to instructional services, the directions are: emphasize continuing improvement of the quality of instruction and programs;

strengthen faculty and staff development opportunities to ensure ongoing renewal and vitality; and implement career development approaches in all degree and certificate programs. Four directions focus on improving access to community college education. They are: strengthen the relationship between the colleges and their communities; expand programs and services for older and non-traditional students; continue to emphasize development of basic skills as a foundation for academic success; and strengthen services to help students make maximal use of the opportunities available through the community colleges. The final four directions are concerned with developing and maintaining high quality administrative services which: strengthen college administrations to improve leadership; reassess activities to increase efficiency; improve cooperation, coordination, and sharing among the community colleges.[41]

Chapter II Footnotes

[1]Alice Stewart Trillin and Associates, Teaching Basic Skills in College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 11.

[2]John E. Roueche and Jerry J. Snow, Overcoming Learning Problems (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), pp. 38-75.

[3]Ibid., pp. 46-52.

[4]Test Collection, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 08541.

[5]Trillin, Teaching Basic Skills, p. 152.

[6]Katherine A. Loomis and others, Remediating and Enriching Performance Learning. Implementing Competency Based Education in Community Colleges (Blacksburg, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED195306, 1980).

[7]Larry Hendrick, An Integrated Student Diagnosis and Instructional Model: A Supplementary Paper to the Educational Programs Report of the Los Rios Community College District Master Plan (Sacramento, California: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED188731, 1980).

[8]Martha Maxwell, Improving Student Learning Skills (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979), pp. 223-54.

[9]Trillin, Teaching Basic Skills, pp. 44-56.

[10]Ibid., pp. 57-61.

[11]Mina Shaunessy, Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 7.

[12]Trillin, Teaching Basic Skills, p. 112.

[13]Nancy K. Snouffer; Linda L. Thistlethwaite, The Effects of the Structured Overview and Vocabulary Pre-Teaching Upon Comprehension Levels of College Freshmen Reading Physical Science and History Materials (Illinois: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED182728, 1979).

[14]Vincent P. Orlando, "Training Students to Use a Modified Version of SQ3R: An Instructional Strategy," Reading World 20 (October 1980):65-70.

[15]Trillin, Teaching Basic Skills, pp. 167-93.

[16]Maxwell, Improving Learning Skills, p. 335.

[17]Carl B. McDonald; Keith Cotrones, Treating the Non-Learner: Penicillin or Placebo? (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED212306, 1981).

[18]Maxwell, Improving Learning Skills, p. 345.

[19]Ibid., pp. 183-95.

[20]Martha F. Wengert, An Investigation of Developmental Education, In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for Education 706, Pepperdine University, Los Angeles, California, 4 December 1981, p. 61.

[21]Ibid., pp. 59,60,61.

[22]Donald T. Rippey, "I Never Get No Respect . . . or Support Either," Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education, 4 (Fall, 1980):12-13.

[23]Ruby Wallace and others, Myth Exposed: Academically Deficient Students Gain 2.3 Grade Equivalents in Only One Semester at a 96% Black Inner-City Community College in South Central Los Angeles or Inner-City Academic Acceleration: How to Structure a Developmental Skills Program so that Black, Inner-City Students Accelerate Their Academic Growth Rate to a Rate 5.9 Times as Great as They Have Achieved in the Past (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED157570, 1978).

[24]James L. Kinneavy, The Writing Program Assessment Project, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, 1980.

[25]Trillin, Teaching Basic Skills, pp. 173-78.

[26]Maxwell, Improving Learning Skills, p. 339.

[27]Ibid., p. 347.

[28]Maxwell, Improving Learning Skills, p. 349.

[29]Ida B. Harding, Adjunct Classes: Organizing Resources for High Risk Students (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 197289, 1980).

[30]Patrick J. Moran, Piggybacking Reading and Study Skills onto College Courses (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED186879, 1980).

[31]Jeffrey Lukenbill; Robert H. McCabe, General Education in a Changing Society. General Education Program, Basic Skills Requirements, Standards of Academic Progress at Miami-Dade Community College (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED158812, 1978).

[32]G.A. Mellander, "Did the Massacre Lead to a Miracle?" Community and Junior College Journal, 50 (1980):12-14.

[33]H.M. Chausow, Remedial Education: A Position Paper. Unpublished paper Chicago, 1979, 16 p. ED 170013.

[34]Esther M. Eddy, Project ASTRA (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED184071, 1979).

[35]Larry Hendrick, Student Diagnosis: A Supplementary Paper to the Educational Programs Report of the Los Rios Community College District Master Plan (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED187392, 1980).

[36]Laverna Fadale and others, Post-Secondary Developmental Studies Programs for Occupational Students: An Impact Study (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 152344, 1977).

[37]John D. Rosella, Effects of the Basic Studies Program on the Scholastic Performance of a Selected Group of Low-Achieving Students Enrolled at Bucks County Community College During the 1973-74 Academic Year (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED119794, 1975).

[38]Laverna M. Fadale; Gene M. Winters, Non-Traditional Student Characteristics Associated with Success in Post-Secondary Career Programs: Implications for Counseling (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED152343, 1978).

[39]Delora P. Conrad, Design and Implementation of a Human Development Program at Northwest Alabama Junior College (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED192821, 1979).

[40]Richard C. Romoser, Results of Second Assessment Study of Developmental Education Programs in Ohio (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED157587, 1978).

[41]Hawaii's Community Colleges: Directions for the '80s, Hawaii University, Honolulu Community College System, a Position Paper (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED181963, 1980).

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

Maxwell says, "I believe that the central concern of college students is success in academic work."[1]

> On July 9, 1969, the New York City Board of Higher Education passed the following three resolutions to launch the new open admissions program:
>
> 1. It shall offer admission to some university program to all high school graduates of the City.
> 2. It shall provide for remedial and other supportive services for all students requiring them.
> 3. It shall maintain and enhance the standards of academic excellence of the colleges of the university.[2]

States Trillin,

> Reading these resolutions now, ten years later, one is struck by both their optimism and their naivete. Even then it was clear that it would be extremely difficult to carry out these three somewhat contradictory policies. It was also clear that the success of the first and third would depend upon how well the second resolution was carried out. There could be no open admissions and no maintenance and enhancement of standards without an effective system of support for the new students. I suspect that no one at the time understood exactly what this meant, or understood the enormous commitment that would be necessary to build this support system.[3]

Says Garner, there is no evidence that any of the basic skills programs, even those cited by Roueche and Kirk as successful (1973) have had the positive advantage of operating in the context of a general accountability model in which each program would operate within the parameters of defined objectives. Results of these previous studies,

particularly the Losak study of the Miami-Dade program, signaled the need for an accountability model and clearly demonstrated that revisions in the Miami-Dade basic skills programs were required.[4] And as the review of literature has shown, revisions and remodelling have occurred at Miami-Dade and a systems approach to improved instruction and learning outcomes have been made operational.

It is clear that an educational system which permits students to voluntarily enroll in courses regardless of academic preparation and without adequate information, advice or support is not a sound method for creating a learning environment in which both faculty and students have an opportunity to succeed.

To determine the impact of the basic skills movement on community colleges,

> The Academy for Educational Development surveyed 103 state postsecondary education agencies, including Section 1202 Commissions, State Higher Education Facilities Commissions, the State Higher Education Executive Officers/National Center for Educational Statistics Communication Network, and the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges, to learn about state trends in basic skills at the college level. In sum, all fifty states were represented in the 75.7 percent response rate.
>
> The Basic skills movement is still in its initial stages of development. Only New Jersey has a full testing program in reading, mathematics, and writing for public and private higher education institutions. Oregon's program was developed jointly by state and local community colleges. Tennessee is now completing the pilot-testing of its program. Florida, Illinois, Wyoming, and North Carolina are discussing the possibility of instituting statewide testing programs in higher education facilities. Only three states, Indiana, Oregon, and Alabama, have set basic

skills performance objectives for postsecondary education. Alabama has established a minimum eighth grade reading level.

The programs in states having basic skills testing programs are designed to measure reading, writing, and mathematic competencies. Fourteen states have testing programs for two-year public community colleges as compared to only seven states requiring it for four-year public colleges or universities. The number of states supporting testing programs at community colleges is double that for four-year public postsecondary institutions. Only one state, New Jersey, provides its testing program to both private and public colleges and universities.

Hawaii, Illinois, and Nebraska want to abolish state support of post secondary remedial programs. Hawaii's legislators have challenged remedial program funding for community colleges but, so far, state funding has been retained. Illinois now provides funds for remedial courses and disadvantaged student projects. The Illinois Board, however, wants remedial coursework to be completed before a student enters a higher education institution. It prefers that such programs, when necessary, be offered only at public community colleges. Illinois is committed to ending remedial programs in public universities within the next three years. At that time, remedial work will become the primary responsibility of the public secondary schools and, if necessary, of the public community colleges. Nebraska's legislators want to abolish all remedial programs in higher education institutions.

Two-year colleges, in particular the public community colleges, have taken a lead role in providing developmental education programs. This role is rooted in both an implicit concern to educate all interested students (partially a result of open admissions) and an explicit mandate at the state level to provide such services.[5]

Developmental programs must include those basic skills, namely fluency in the language, the ability to read, write and compute. They are crucial for continued learning in more complex subject areas, be they academic and/or technical. Also, critical components for program success are

assessment and diagnosis of skill deficiencies and program evaluation for continued efficiency.

In each of the areas authorities in the field have presented a variety of practices and program characteristics which they report to be successful. Necessary academic abilities have been listed by skill. Student diagnosis and prescription are essential for clear course and program direction. Appropriate course materials in the form of texts, audio-visuals, and computer assisted instruction can be utilized more effectively along a continuum of instruction.

Success has been determined by subjective and objective methods. Subjective methods of evaluation are: increased student retention, specifically longer enrollment and lower dropout rates and increased numbers of students mainstreamed into standard academic coursework. Program completion is evidenced by certification or receipt of an A.A. or A.S. degree and/or transfer to a four-year institution are key. An objective method of evaluation is the use of standardized, norm and/or criterion referenced text instruments which in a pretest/posttest setting indicate if a skill has been learned.

This author chose only those practices which can be measured quantifiably and qualitatively. Practices and program characteristics as described in this paper were selected on the basis of their high correlation with instructional improvement and increased student learning.

It was found that to obtain the most educational benefits from a basic skills program, the following should occur: instructional goals and program objectives must be clearly defined and explained; all instructional activity should lead to reaching the instructional goals, specifically remediating diagnosed deficiencies; all program activity should lead to overall effectiveness.

Program goals should have a college-wide impact. Basic skills program goals must mesh with the college's mission and its requirements for certification, A.A., A.S. degree and/or transfer.

Basic skills program offerings should be sequential, teaching a hierarchy of skills which are preliminary to or may be taken in conjunction with regular courses. This kind of approach is integrative and can be interdisciplinary. A basic skills program is strengthened when the instruction is simultaneously remediating and integrating. The student is supported and prepared for the next step, regular coursework and more complex, self-directed learning activities.

Cohen & Brower attribute much of the success of compensatory programs to the special treatment given to students in these programs. They say that when special treatment is applied, when students are given supplemental counseling, tutoring and learning aids, when they are provided with a greater variety of learning materials than other students receive, and when they are singled out for additional work, they tend to remain in school. They say,

perhaps the most important and most difficult goal for community college educators in the 1980s is to devise methods to ensure that all high risk students receive special treatment.[6]

In an effort to determine how the Los Angeles Community College District is applying special treatment to its high risk students through successful basic skills practices, interviews were conducted with key personnel and administrators. The question was asked, "What successful instructional practices and/or program characteristics are you experiencing in the area of basic skills?" The findings are presented here.

At Valley College, individualized, one-to-one instruction is emphasized. In the area of writing, the Garrison method is used for composition. The Structural Essay, a Formula for Writing by M. Spangler and R. Werner is used in English 28 and 1. It is based on Helen Mills' mastery learning technique. Valley is bolstering its ESL instruction and faculty are pleased with their efforts toward the Success of the Faculty Institute in ESL, a districtwide series of seminars during Spring 1982.[7]

At City College, a great number of basic skills courses are offered to address the remedial need of its student population. Developmental Communications and ESL courses have expanded. The Learning Resource Center is partially staffed by three part-time faculty who rotate from other departments: English, math and developmental

communications. This procedure aids coordination between the four components.[8]

Harbor College is improving assessment and evaluation in the area of English. The department has begun a procedure of administering a holistically scored, one topic essay to determine proficiency in English 28. All members of the department are participating in the evaluation and papers are scored by predetermined criteria. The English 21 offering is presented using two approaches. English 21 attacks writing deficiencies using a grammar/writing methodology. English 30 attacks similar skills deficiencies and further prepares students for English 28 by using a reading/writing approach. The Learning Assistance Center goes beyond remediation in the area of math and English. It provides a whole range of learning activities.[9]

Southwest College has been concentrating in the area of reading. It has demonstrated its ability to increase student reading comprehension through various experimental designs. Its most recent success has been a $100,000 award from the Strengthening Developing Institutions Program (SDIP). The college showed reading improvement by supplementing instruction with computer assisted instruction. Six PLATO computers and accompanying software were used in the experiment. The Learning Resource Center staff is pleased with the results that students effect from the autotutor program. Both this and the AVT program in reading and math give comprehensive feedback. The staff is remindful that although

some equipment is better than most, the critical feature of an individualized learning situation is the positive stroking that the staff can give students when software is distributed. The staff must show it cares that students succeed. They say that if students think they can perform well, they will. Positive, goal directed attitudes by faculty and staff contribute to student achievement.[10]

At Pierce College, ESL is structured by a progression of skills levels that go below the current 84,85,86 designation. It has included two additional lower levels, 82 and 83. The English department has conducted follow-up studies of its program and found that 5 to 8 percent of its student population enters developmental communications while 40 to 50 percent enters English 21 and 35 percent enrolls into English 28 on the average each semester. Thirty percent of the students who complete English 21 go on to enroll in English 1.[11]

West Los Angeles College has a collegewide tutorial program which is headquartered in the Learning Resource Center. It involves four levels of tutor expertise and staff undergo a comprehensive training program. Interpersonal skills and instructor contact for updating of content are part of training. Peer tutors are used; and, to qualify, a student must receive a grade of A or B from the content area instructor, along with his/her recommendation.[12]

Los Angeles Trade Technical College has a centrally located, ultra modern Learning Resource Center (LRC) which

houses printed materials in its library component. It is well staffed with helpful, knowledgeable personnel. Other LRC components are media services and expanding computer assisted instruction. It has fully integrated a wide variety of instructional resources. It covers a full range of learning levels from remedial through advanced subject area studies. The Writing Lab, VEA, and EOPS, math, developmental communications and language arts classes are all operating under the same roof and are integrating and supporting intersegmental activities in an effort to strengthen basic skills activities through improved coordination. Unlike other colleges, the Language Arts department has the structural advantage of being an umbrella for all basic skills components except math. Ideally, goals and objectives should be more clearly defined and achieved by a staff that is in close proximity and can exchange ideas and interact easily. Reading instructors have been strengthening and re-structuring the reading component by connecting goals and objectives to diagnostic/prescriptive instruction, computer assisted instruction and standardized pre/posttest uniform testing. As part of staff development, Los Angeles Trade Technical College hosted a districtwide ESL conference in Spring 1982.[13]

At East Los Angeles College, the Office of Instruction published a 1981 study funded by a Basic Skills Grant from the Division of Educational Services. It is entitled "Developmental Skills and Learning Assistance Support Services." The report points out the need for formative and summative

evaluation. It says that program evaluation has been limited or non-existent. It contains a proposed evaluation checklist which represents a distillation from two evaluation institutes conducted for learning assistance centers directors (Clymer-Walvekar). Its author, Gwyn Enright, recommended that a developmental skills program use appropriate combinations of the list (see Appendix B). The report also states that guidelines for formative evaluation, that which is conducted during the course of the program in order to improve or revise it, includes building in data collection methods at the same time that operational procedures for the Learning Assistance Support System (LASS) are specified. Information collection should be systematic, ongoing and unobtrusive.

Once the data has been gathered, it must be analyzed and examined to help both evaluators and administrators make appropriate decisions about program operation, modification, continuation, or deletion. Only that data which will be used needs to be collected, analyzed and stored. Evaluation must show cost benefits. Internal evaluators are usually involved in formative evaluation while an external evaluator is usually hired to conduct a summative evaluation which can more objectively determine a program's overall effectiveness. To assist in performing a valid, summative evaluation, Maxwell lists frequently used evaluator criteria (see Appendix C).[14]

The Los Angeles Community College District has been making districtwide efforts to improve standards. Los

Angeles Trade Technical College, Harbor College and Mission College are participating in project ASSET--Assessment of Skills for Successful Entry and Transfer. This is a three-year pilot program in conjunction with the American College Testing Program. It focuses on helping disadvantaged students. Its purpose is to improve a stated district need for "systematic assessment of students' skills and needs followed by course advisement."[15] The assessment instrument includes components for reading skills, language usage skills, numerical and algebra skills. Cut-off scores have been determined for placement in basic skills classes. Computerized midterm evaluation and follow-up is communicated to all participating students. Its seven major emphases are identification/recruitment, assessment, counseling, instruction, retention, transfer, and follow-up.

In the area of staff development, a district report stated a "need to know the most effective strategies to use in teaching non-traditional students."[16] The Faculty Institute, 1981-82, conducted a series of ESL seminars for instructional improvement in the area. During 1982-83, the Faculty Institute is conducting a series of staff development seminars. "In the Trenches" is a writing course being implemented for the purpose of developing innovative and effective techniques in the instruction of composition. The seminars are a cooperative effort between the Los Angeles Community College District and the University of California at Los Angeles.

In his 1982 State of the District Address, Dr. Leslie Koltai, Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District, said the following:

> The nature of work is in flux as we change from an economy dependent upon machinery and production into the management of knowledge and information. There are new work roles and jobs that probably didn't even exist 25 years ago.
>
> In this ecology of education, as he called it, community colleges are occupying the most significant domain. More than 4½ million students nationwide benefit from a new societal institution--an original American invention: the community college.
>
> In a historical perspective, there was very little discussion about the mission of the community college in the '60s and '70s when the national compulsion to provide "instant equity" to the socially, professionally and educationally disenfranchised opened the door to higher education. But Harvard researcher Patricia Cross said: "We have probably proved that we can deliver on our promise to open the doors of access to college. But we have not demonstrated that we can deliver an education that is attractive and useful to the majority of Americans. . . . If the Access Model is to have meaning, it must be supported by a Learning Model that makes access to higher education more than a hollow victory."
>
> Last year, I said that "the Los Angeles Community College District has always occupied a leadership role in terms of quality education and academic change."
>
> I believe that the learning model Dr. Cross talked about is the need for significant increase in time on tasks and involvement in learning by the community college student.[17]

Chapter III Footnotes

[1]Martha Maxwell, Improving Student Learning Skills (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979), p. 1.

[2]Alice Stewart Trillin and Associates, Teaching Basic Skills in College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979), p. 2.

[3]Ibid., p. 3.

[4]Kurt V. Lauridsen, editor, New Directions for College Learning Assistance, Examining the Scope of Learning Centers (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), pp. 25-26.

[5]Gayla Kraetsch, "The Role of Community Colleges in the Basic Skills Movement," Community College Review, 8 (Fall 1980), 19-21.

[6]Jack Friedlander, "Educational Abilities and Success of Students Enrolled in Community College Liberal Arts Courses," Community College Review, 9 (Spring 1982), 57.

[7]Gertrude Fujii, Steve Statham, George Herrick, interview held at Los Angeles Valley College, Van Nuys, California, November 16, 1982.

[8]Mr. Paul Whalen, Dean of Instruction, interview held at Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles, California, November 22, 1982.

[9]Joan Dawson, Chairperson, English Department; Jack Radabaugh, Coordinator of Los Angeles Harbor College, Wilmington, California, telephone interview, November 23, 1982.

[10]Ruby Wallace, Lawrence Pleasant, Assistant Dean of Instruction, interview held at Los Angeles Southwest College, Los Angeles, California, November 1982. Telephone interview held with Alex Slabo, November 17, 1982.

[11]William Landau, Chairperson, English Department, Los Angeles Pierce College, Woodland Hills, California, telephone interview, November 19, 1982.

[12]Tutorial Lab Technician, West Los Angeles College, Los Angeles, California, telephone interview, November 1, 1982.

[13]Dr. Thomas Lakin, Dean of Instruction, interview held at Los Angeles Trade Technical College, Los Angeles, California, November 29, 1982.

[14]Gwyn Enright, Developmental Skills and Learning Assistance Support Services. Office of Instruction, East Los Angeles College, 1981, 19-22.

[15]Kathryn R. Akers, Strengthening Developmental Skills in the Los Angeles Community College District, Division of Educational Services, Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles, California, November 1981, 23.

[16]Ibid., p. 25.

[17]Dr. Leslie Koltai, Chancellor, Los Angeles Community College District; Dr. Kenneth Washington, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services; Dr. Glenna Scheer, interviews held at the District Office of the Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles, California, November 24, 1982, and December 3, 1982.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Entering through the open doors of America's community colleges is a massively underprepared student population. It lacks the necessary academic basic skills for success in college coursework as evidenced by course completion, certification, receipt of an A.A. or A.S. degree and transfer to upper division four-year colleges.

If the educational needs of the community require basic skills remediation, then it is the mission of the community college to provide it, because the purpose for the existence of the community college is to serve the community. Says Thornton,

> Educational disadvantage is not restricted to any identifiable social group. Persons of good ability can fail to achieve no matter what their social or economic status, and quite without regard to their ethnic origins or their places of residence. Moore points out that high risk whites outnumber marginal blacks. The development of learning skills for all high risk students requires a commitment to a quality educational program, not just to a specific target group. . . . The community college task is to accept the student who needs and desires more education and to develop techniques to satisfy his needs.[1]

In a time of shrinking budgets and reduction in funding allocations for educational programs, the need for successful basic skills programs is acutely necessary. There are public and legislative outcries for accountability

and improvement in standards. Indeed, excellence and quality are the catch words for the 1980s.

Cost benefit analysis is applicable to these program efforts. A formula has been devised which enables the user to compute the cost per graduate for students who receive and do not receive basic skills. It also allows for inter-campus comparison. The following formula provides one mechanism for calculating the efficiency of any postsecondary program which has as its goal advancement of the graduation chances of a group of college students:

$$E = \frac{(C_1 \ldots\ldots (x) X R}{G}$$

where E is the expense of producing one college graduate; C_1 through C_x represents the diminishing numbers in an entering program over a set period of years; R represents the resources devoted to one program student; and G represents the number of graduates from program C after x years.[2]

All community colleges have established basic skills courses and/or programs to help underprepared students succeed in college. These activities, when run well, are successful in promoting the educational attainment of high-risk students. In summary, low achieving students who participate in these programs are more likely to achieve higher grade point averages in college-level courses, attend classes more regularly, have lower course and program attrition rates and perform successfully in future coursework.

Future programs must continue to be effective both in instruction and cost. Although successful instructional practices and program characteristics have been recognized, insufficient formative and summative evaluation of courses and programs and lack of follow-up on students' attainment of long-range goals have contributed to doubts about the effectiveness of basic skills programs.

Chapters II and III, Review of Literature and Findings, provide significant information for a strengthened program in basic skills; indeed, for an effective, efficient "success model" for community colleges. It would consist of a structure whose components are (1) assessment-diagnostic/prescriptive procedures; (2) writing; (3) reading; (4) ESL; (5) math; and (6) formative and summative evaluation. Those clear objectives for skills development and accompanying teaching strategies found in Chapters II and III should be the basis for a substructure for the instructional components (2), (3), (4) and (5). Once a structure has been modeled, there should be instructional access to all afforded resources, especially those produced by the learning resource center. (Appendix A)

Writing, reading and ESL should be under one department. Although math is a separate department administering math remediation, there should be interaction with the English department. Since the same logical thinking skills are necessary in writing and math, core courses in math and English should be devised which simultaneously enhance both

subjects. Block scheduling and team teaching allows students to sense the interrelatedness of learning. This technique facilitates mainstreaming. A variety of teaching methodology should be utilized.

Operationally, the separate departments should be guided by program objectives, sequential course goals and procedures which are cost effective. An input, process/control, output systems approach is recommended. The end product is both instructional and behavioral. The student will become a self-directed learner.

If procedures follow a mode of management by objectives, then evaluation should be one of testing product. Continued student and program evaluation is essential. Student evaluation should be norm referenced and criterion referenced. The term continual adds formative evaluation to summative evaluation. Educators should be able to proudly report to their clientele that, based on sound evaluative procedures, they have done what they said they would do in a systematic manner that remained responsive to the individual student.

We believe that all people can achieve. We believe in our students and know that they are adults who may be limited by previous experiences, but are anxious and capable of acquiring skills and developing postures for success. Clearly, the challenge facing community colleges in the 1980s is to systematize the basic skills successes of the 1960s and '70s into viable programs for future achievement.

Chapter IV Footnotes

[1]James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College, 3rd edition (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972), p. 64.

[2]Joseph W. Arwardy, The Transitional Curriculum Program: Toward Learner Independence Through Developmental Education (Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED197662, 1980).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University and Colleges, and the University of California, Statements on Preparation in English and Mathematics--Competencies Expected of Entering Freshmen Remedial and Baccalaureate-Level Coursework Admission Requirements." Academic Council (November 18, 1981):3.

Akers, Kathryn R. Strengthening Developmental Skills in the Los Angeles Community College District. Division of Educational Services, Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles, California, November 1981, 23.

Arwardy, Joseph W. The Transitional Curriculum Program: Toward Learner Independence Through Developmental Education. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service. ED197662, 1980.

California Postsecondary Education Commission, Promises to Keep Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities September Draft, 1982, V.

Chausow, H.M. Remedial Education: A Position Paper. Unpublished paper Chicago, 1979, 16 p. ED 170013.

Conrad, Delora P. Design and Implementation of a Human Development Program at Northwest Alabama Junior College. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service. ED192821, 1979.

Cross, Patricia. Accent on Learning: Improving Instruction and Reshaping the Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Dawson, Joan, Chairperson, English Department; Jack Radabaugh, Coordinator of Los Angeles Harbor College, Wilmington, California, telephone interview, November 23, 1982.

Eddy, Esther M. Project ASTRA. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED184071. 1979.

Edge, Donald. Report of the New Jersey Basic Skills Council. Trenton, New Jersey: ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED185098, 1979.

Enright, Gwyn. Developmental Skills and Learning Assistance Support Services. Office of Instruction, East Los Angeles College, 1981, 19-22.

Fadale, Laverna, and others. Post-Secondary Developmental Studies Programs for Occupational Students: An Impact Study. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 152344, 1977.

Fadale, Laverna M.; Gene M. Winters. Non-Traditional Student Characteristics Associated with Success in Post-Secondary Career Programs: Implications for Counseling. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED152343, 1978.

Friedlander, Jack. "Educational Abilities and Success of Students Enrolled in Community College Liberal Arts Courses." Community College Review, 9 (Spring 1982), 57.

Fujii, Gertrude; Steve Statham; George Herrick. Interview held at Los Angeles Valley College, Van Nuys, California, November 16, 1982.

Harding, Ida B. Adjunct Classes: Organizing Resources for High Risk Students. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 197289, 1980.

Hawaii's Community Colleges: Directions for the '80s, Hawaii University, Honolulu Community College System, a Position Paper. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED181963, 1980.

Hendrick, Larry. Student Diagnosis: A Supplementary Paper to the Educational Programs Report of the Los Rios Community College District Master Plan. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED187392, 1980.

Johnson, B. Lamar. Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1964.

Kinneavy, James L. The Writing Program Assessment Project. University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, 1980.

Koltai, Leslie, Dr., Chancellor, Los Angeles Community College District. "State of the District Address" presented November 3, 1982, District Administrative Office, Los Angeles, California.

Koltai, Leslie, Dr., Chancellor, Los Angeles Community College District; Dr. Kenneth Washington, Vice Chancellor, Educational Services; Dr. Glenna Scheer. Interviews held at the District Office of the Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles, California, November 24, 1982, and December 3, 1982.

Kraetsch, Gayla. "The Role of Community Colleges in the Basic Skills Movement." Community College Review, 8 (Fall 1980), 19-21.

Lakin, Thomas, Dr., Dean of Instruction. Interview held at Los Angeles Trade Technical College, Los Angeles, California, November 29, 1982.

Landau, William, Chairperson, English Department. Los Angeles Pierce College, Woodland Hills, California. Telephone interview November 19, 1982.

Lauridsen, Kurt V., ed. New Directions for College Learning Assistance, Examining the Scope of Learning Centers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Loomis, Katherine A., and others. Remediatin and Enriching Performance Learning. Implementing Competency Based Education in Community Colleges. Blacksburg, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED195306, 1980.

Lukenbill, Jeffrey; Robert H. McCabe, General Education in a Changing Society. General Education Program, Basic Skills Requirements, Standards of Academic Progress at Miami-Dade Community College. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED158812, 1978.

Mangham, Clarence. Basic Skills Study Report. Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (October 26, 1979), 6.

Maxwell, Martha. Improving Student Learning Skills. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

McCabe, Robert H. "Excellence Is for Everyone." Speech presented at the Workshop, Transfer, Honors, and Excellence, Los Angeles Harbor College, Wilmington, California 90744, October 28, 1982.

McDonald, Carl B; Keith Cotrones. Treating the Non-Learner: Penicillin or Placebo? Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED212306, 1981.

Mellander, G.A. "Did the Massacre Lead to a Miracle?" Community and Junior College Journal, 50 (1980):12-14.

Moran, Patrick J. Piggybacking Reading and Study Skills onto College Courses. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED186879, 1980.

Orlando, Vincent P. "Training Students to Use a Modified Version of SQ3R: An Instructional Strategy." Reading World 20 (October 1980):65-70.

Rippey, Donald T. "I Never Get No Respect . . . or Support Either." Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education, 4 (Fall, 1980):12-13.

Romoser, Richard C. Results of Second Assessment Study of Developmental Education Programs in Ohio. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED157587, 1978.

Rosella, John D. Effects of the Basic Studies Program on the Scholastic Performance of a Selected Group of Low-Achieving Students Enrolled at Bucks County Community College During the 1973-74 Academic Year. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED119794, 1975.

Roueche, John E.; Jerry J. Snow. Overcoming Learning Problems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Shaunessy, Mina. Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Snouffer, Nancy K.; Linda L. Thistlethwaite. The Effects of the Structured Overview and Vocabulary Pre-Teaching Upon Comprehension Levels of College Freshmen Reading Physical Science and History Materials. Illinois: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED182728, 1979.

Test Collection. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, 08541.

Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College, 3rd edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972.

Trillin, Alice Stewart and Associates. Teaching Basic Skills in College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Tutorial Lab Technician, West Los Angeles College, Los Angeles, California. Telephone interview November 1, 1982.

Wallace, Ruby, and others. Myth Exposed: Academically Deficient Students Gain 2.3 Grade Equivalents in Only One Semester at a 96% Black Inner-City Community College in South Central Los Angeles or Inner-City Academic Acceleration: How to Structure a Developmental Skills Program so that Black, Inner-City Students Accelerate Their Academic Growth Rate to a Rate 5.9 Times as Great as They Have Achieved in the Past. Alexandria, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED157570, 1978.

Wallace, Ruby; Lawrence Pleasant, Assistant Dean of Instruction. Interview held at Los Angeles Southwest College, Los Angeles, California, November 1982. Telephone interview held with Alex Slabo, November 17, 1982.

Wengert, Martha F. "An Investigation of Developmental Education," unpublished paper in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for Education 706, Pepperdine University, December 4, 1981.

Whalen, Paul, Dean of Instruction. Interview held at Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles, California, November 22, 1982.

Yarrington, Roger. "Literacy in Community Colleges Overview." ERIC Junior College Resource Review (Spring 1982):2.

BASIC SKILLS / DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE

DETERMINATION OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICES

An Adaptation of

"An Evaluation Design for Developmental Education" - J. Roueche, J. Snow.
"Remediation Study Campus Survey" - California Postsecondary Education Commission 1982

A. CONTEXT

1. Name of your college.

2. Is your college (1) rural, (2) suburban, or (3) inner city?

3. Approximately how many students are enrolled in basic skills, remediation, developmental skills courses?

   a. less than 2,000
   b. between 2,001 and 6,000
   c. between 6,001 and 10,000
   d. between 10,001 and 15,000
   e. between 15,001 and 20,000
   f. more than 20,000

4. What percentage is the above number of the total student population?

5. Does your college offer a comprehensive basic skills/developmental education program?

6. How successful have you been in the coordination of the English, math, and developmental education departments with VEA and EOP&S and Student Services?

B. PHILOSOPHY

1. Do you agree that 90% of all students can learn at a mastery level what you are teaching if they are given sufficient time and appropriate help?

	agree			disagree		agree			disagree
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

2. Is there a written statement describing your developmental philosophy which is distributed to students?

	good statement			none		good statement			none
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

3. Are there written learning objectives which are distributed to students?

	usually			never		usually			never
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

C. RATIONALE

1. Is the developmental remedial program:

a. To develop academic survival skills, e.g. study skills, reading, writing, memory, etc.

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

b. To develop the students' self-concept, e.g. self-esteem, confidence, level of aspiration, achievement motivation, etc.

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

c. To prepare students for regular college work.

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

d. To develop skills which are related to job and family responsibilities.

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

e. To improve your present college's response to high-risk students.

	systematically			not at all		systematically			not at all
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

2. Does your program: (Rank order, using a 1 for the most important, a 2 for the next most important, etc.)

	Actual	Ideal
a. Encourage students to select a transfer program?	___	___
b. Encourage students to select a vocational technical program?	___	___
c. Encourage students to select a program of study based on their own interests regardless of career opportunities?	___	___

	Actual	Ideal
d. Provide little direction as to future plans?	___	___

D. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

1. Which one of the following descriptions best represents your present developmental studies organizational structure?

   a. The addition of isolated developmental courses in discipline curricula, i.e., adding developmental reading to the list of approved courses in English.

   b. The addition of courses in disciplines which are highly supportive of developmental efforts.

   c. Working with an interdisciplinary group of instructors who remain attached to their disciplines organizationally, but who cooperate with instructors from other disciplines and with counselors attached to these courses.

   d. Establishment of an academic division or department of developmental studies which plans, coordinates and allocates funds for instruction, counseling and other support services.

   e. Establishment of a Learning Resources Center which provides territory, daignostic assistance and other supportive assistance with academic courses.

   f. Other. (Please specify.)

Learning Assistance Center

2. Does your institution have a Learning Assistance Center?

   ACTUAL: (1) Yes (2) No IDEAL: (1) Yes (2) No

If so, is it characterized by:	Actual Yes	Actual No	Ideal Yes	Ideal No
a. Instructional Staff				
(1) Full-time professionals	___	___	___	___
(2) Part-time professionals	___	___	___	___
(3) Para-professionals	___	___	___	___
(4) Peer tutors	___	___	___	___
(5) Teaching interns	___	___	___	___

	Actual		Ideal	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
b. Counseling Staff				
(1) Full-time professionals	—	—	—	—
(2) Part-time professionals	—	—	—	—
(3) Para-professionals	—	—	—	—
(4) Peer counselors	—	—	—	—
(5) Counseling interns	—	—	—	—
c. An administrative and budgetary relationship to:				
(1) Academic services	—	—	—	—
(2) Student services	—	—	—	—

Additional Support Services

3. Does your college have a media production center?	—	—	—	—
4. Does your college provide audio-visual support?	—	—	—	—
5. Does your college have a day care center?	—	—	—	—
a. Is it a lab school for a child developmental program?	—	—	—	—
b. Is it open during the evening?	—	—	—	—

E. STAFFING

1. How effective are your instructors in causing learning in high-risk students?

	good			poor		good			poor
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

2. Do you have any special instructional or training programs to assist your faculty to work with high-risk students?

3. Are counselors attached to developmental courses or programs?

4. Are counselors provided any special instructional or training programs to assist them in working with high-risk students?

5. How effective are your regular counselors in developing the potential of high-risk students?

	good			poor		good			poor
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

6. How effective are your tutors in assisting high-risk students with their academic work?

	good			poor		good			poor
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

F. ADMISSIONS AND PLACEMENT OF STUDENTS

1. For new students attending your college for the first time, what records do you require? (Check the appropriate blank.)

	Actual	Ideal
a. Transcripts of previous educational experiences	___	___
b. Test scores	___	___
c. Demographic data sheet	___	___
d. Valid identification	___	___
e. Other. (Please specify.)	___	___

2. Please rank the following placement methods you use in placing students into developmental courses or programs. (Rank order, using 1 for the most important and 2 for the next most important, etc.)

	Actual	Ideal
a. Student self-referral	___	___
b. Testing	___	___
c. Previous educational record	___	___
d. Counseling	___	___
e. Teacher referral	___	___
f. Other (Please specify.)	___	___

3. Do you offer diagnostic testing or assessment services?

ACTUAL: (1) Yes (2) No IDEAL: (1) Yes (2) No

a. Are they required for admission?

ACTUAL: (1) Yes (2) No IDEAL: (1) Yes (2) No

4. What tests do you commonly use for diagnostic placement purposes? (Rank according to frequency used.)

	Actual	Ideal
a. A.C.T.	___	___
b. S.A.T.	___	___
c. Nelson Denny Reading Test	___	___
d. Stanford Achievement Test	___	___
e. McGraw Hill Series	___	___
f. Comparative Guidance and Placement Test	___	___
g. A Self-Concept Test	___	___
h. A personality test	___	___
i. Locally designed tests	___	___
j. Other (Please specify.)	___	___
k. Stanford-TASK-Test of Academic Skills	___	___

5. Are your developmental courses mandatory?

ACTUAL: (1) Yes (2) No IDEAL: (1) Yes (2) No

6. Are your developmental courses optional?

ACTUAL: (1) Yes (2) No IDEAL: (1) Yes (2) No

G. INSTRUCTION	Actual Yes	Actual No	Ideal Yes	Ideal No
1. Are your developmental remedial courses characterized by:				
a. Non-credit	___	___	___	___
b. Nondegree credit	___	___	___	___
c. Degree credit	___	___	___	___
d. Full term in length	___	___	___	___

	Actual Yes	Actual No	Ideal Yes	Ideal no
e. Less than full term	—	—	—	—
2. Are your developmental remedial practices characterized by:				
a. Providing students with course goals and objectives at the beginning of term?	—	—	—	—
b. Providing at least two alternative learning activities for each learning objective?	—	—	—	—
c. Providing a variety of assessment methods?	—	—	—	—
d. Test items which are developed from pre-stated objectives?	—	—	—	—
e. Information is gathered on the students' opinion of the methods employed in the course which is used in revising instructional activities.	—	—	—	—
f. Students are allowed to restudy unmastered source objectives and retake tests to attain mastery.	—	—	—	—
3. Do high-risk students carry a lighter academic load than "traditional" students?	—	—	—	—
4. Is there an attempt made by your college to promote non-punitive grading, i.e., IP = In Progress?	—	—	—	—
5. Are developmental remedial courses smaller than regular courses?	—	—	—	—
H. EVALUATION				
1. Does your college evaluate developmental courses or programs in a systematic manner?	—	—	—	—
2. Does your evaluation system utilize:				
a. Retention attrition records	—	—	—	—
b. Analysis of grade point averages	—	—	—	—
c. Follow-up records, e.g. grades in non-remedial courses, success in job or transfer, etc.	—	—	—	—

	Actual Yes	Actual No	Ideal Yes	Ideal No
d. Attitudinal measures, e.g. O.P.I., local tests, etc.	—	—	—	—
e. Self-concept measures, e.g. Locus of Control scales, i.e. Tennessee Self-Concept Test, etc.	—	—	—	—
f. Student perceptions of the college, e.g. Student Reaction to College, local tests, etc.	—	—	—	—
g. Pre-, post-tests	—	—	—	—
h. Control or contrast groups	—	—	—	—
i. Comparison of achievements to pre-stated program objectives.	—	—	—	—
3. Who does the evaluating of your developmental/remedial programs or courses?				
a. Faculty	—	—	—	—
b. Academic Dean	—	—	—	—
c. Director of Institutional Research	—	—	—	—
d. Director of Developmental Studies	—	—	—	—
e. Students in remedial programs	—	—	—	—
f. Other college personnel	—	—	—	—
g. Outside evaluator	—	—	—	—

4. Approximately what proportion of the full-time student body is enrolled in developmental courses?	Actual	Ideal
a. Less than 10 percent	—	—
b. Between 10 and 20 percent	—	—
c. Between 20 and 30 percent	—	—
d. Between 30 and 40 percent	—	—
e. Between 40 and 50 percent	—	—
f. More than 50 percent	—	—

	Actual	Ideal
5. How many of these students who begin these courses or the program successfully complete it?		
a. More than 90 percent	___	___
b. Between 80 and 90 percent	___	___
c. Between 70 and 80 percent	___	___
d. Between 60 and 70 percent	___	___
e. Between 50 and 60 percent	___	___
f. Between 40 and 50 percent	___	___
g. Less than 40 percent	___	___
6. How many persist to the second semester in the program or in regular courses?		
a. More than 90 percent	___	___
b. Between 80 and 90 percent	___	___
c. Between 70 and 80 percent	___	___
d. Between 60 and 70 percent	___	___
e. Between 50 and 60 percent	___	___
f. Between 40 and 50 percent	___	___
g. Less than 40 percent	___	___
7. How many persist to the third semester in the program or in regular courses?		
a. More than 90 percent	___	___
b. Between 80 and 90 percent	___	___
c. Between 70 and 80 percent	___	___
d. Between 60 and 70 percent	___	___
e. Between 50 and 60 percent	___	___
f. Between 40 and 50 percent	___	___
g. Less than 40 percent	___	___

	Actual	Ideal
8. How many complete on a degree or certificate program?		
a. More than 90 percent	___	___
b. Between 80 and 90 percent	___	___
c. Between 70 and 80 percent	___	___
d. Between 60 and 70 percent	___	___
e. Between 50 and 60 percent	___	___
f. Between 40 and 50 percent	___	___
g. Less than 40 percent	___	___
9. How many, of those who did not complete a degree or certificate, transferred to another college or met their own educational objectives?		
a. More than 90 percent	___	___
b. Between 80 and 90 percent	___	___
c. Between 70 and 80 percent	___	___
d. Between 60 and 70 percent	___	___
e. Between 50 and 60 percent	___	___
f. Between 40 and 50 percent	___	___
g. Less than 40 percent	___	___

10. In your opinion how successful is your developmental/remedial program?

	good			poor		good			poor
ACTUAL:	4	3	2	1	IDEAL:	4	3	2	1

Course Characteristics

11. What percentage of remedial course sections were offered during academic year 1981-82 by the following types of administrative units on your campus?

	English or Mathematics Department	Other Academic Departments	Learning Assistance/ Skills Centers	Other Units	Total
Reading	____%	____%	____%	____%	100%
Writing	____%	____%	____%	____%	100%
Mathematics	____%	____%	____%	____%	100%
ESL	____%	____%	____%	____%	100%

Costs

12. Please indicate the amount of your institutional budget, excluding capital outlay, expended by your institution on remedial courses and remedial support services for academic years 1978-79, 1979-80, and 1980-81. Include salaries, benefits, administrative costs, materials, and equipment charges in your figures.

	Academic Year 1978-79	Academic Year 1979-80	Academic Year 1980-81
Total Institutional Budget (operating budget exclusive of capital outlay)	$_____	$_____	$_____
Remedial Courses:			
Reading	$_____	$_____	$_____
Writing	$_____	$_____	$_____
Mathematics	$_____	$_____	$_____
ESL	$_____	$_____	$_____
Subtotal	$_____	$_____	$_____*
Remedial Support Services	$_____	$_____	$_____**
Total Remediation Expenditures	$_____	$_____	$_____***

(Asterisked figures should agree with figures in Question 12a.)

12a. Please indicate the funding sources for your expenditures on remediation activities during academic year 1980-81. (Community colleges should include local property tax revenue under State category.)

Sources of Funding	Remedial Courses	Remedial Support Services	Total
Federal	$_____	$_____	$_____
State	$_____	$_____	$_____
Special/Institutional	$_____	$_____	$_____
Student Fees	$_____	$_____	$_____
Direct Assessment (class fees)	$_____	$_____	$_____
Grants	$_____	$_____	$_____
Other	$_____	$_____	$_____
Total	$_____*	$_____**	$_____***

(Asterisked figures should agree with figures in Question 12.)

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What are the successful program characteristics in basic skills at your college?
2. Please describe successful practices you have experienced in:
   a. assessment/diagnosis
   b. writing
   c. reading
   d. ESL
   e. math
   f. evaluation

Appendix B

from: Developmental Skills and Learning Assistance Support Services, Gwyn Enright Office of Instruction East Los Angeles College 1981

A more logically organized evaluation scheme is the following check list which represents a distillation from two evaluation institutes conducted for learning assistance centers directors (Clymer-Walvekar, in press) The LASS evaluation could include appropriate combinations of the following points:

1.0 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 Goals of program reflective of instructional goals
- 1.2 Goals of program reflective of departmental goals
- 1.3 Overall goals and specific objectives (timing, scheduling, services) matched to needs of student population to be served
- 1.4 Cost effectiveness of program
- 1.5 Organization of program
- 1.6 Organization of staff
- 1.7 Staff selection
- 1.8 Staff supervision
- 1.9 Staff communication channels

2.0 PERSONNEL

- 2.1 Ongoing training
- 2.2 Communication skills
- 2.3 Interpersonal skills
- 2.4 Professional development
- 2.5 Interaction with faculty/staff
- 2.6 Interaction with other inhouse staff
- 2.7 Impact on students
- 2.8 Delivery techniques/style
- 2.9 Time management

3.0 MATERIALS

- 3.1 Variety of materials appropriate for client's needs and program goals
- 3.2 Appropriate sequence of materials
- 3.3 Appropriate selection of materials for client's diagnosed affective and cognitive needs
- 3.4 Appropriate selection for client's preferences
- 3.5 Staff developed materials

4.0 INSTRUCTION

- 4.1 Individualized delivery method
- 4.2 Self-paced delivery method
- 4.3 Small group delivery method
- 4.4 Large group delivery method
- 4.5 Tutorial delivery method
- 4.6 Competency based delivery method
- 4.7 Norm based delivery method
- 4.8 Appropriate selection of method for clients' varied learning styles
- 4.9 Appropriateness of scheduling

5.0 CLIENTS

- 5.1 Determination of goals
- 5.2 Assessment of skill needs
- 5.3 Assessment of personal needs
- 5.4 Assessment of learning style
- 5.5 Assessment of attitude
- 5.6 Change in learning behavior
- 5.7 Change in skills
- 5.8 Change in attitude
- 5.9 Change in academic record
- 5.10 Change of expectations
- 5.11 Long range effectiveness of change
- 5.12 Accomplishment of goals
- 5.13 Utility of change
- 5.14 Transfer of changes to other courses
- 5.15 Transfer of changes to job skills
- 5.16 Transfer of changes to life skills

6.0 LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

- 6.1 Physical arrangement of facility
- 6.2 Accessability of facility/location
- 6.3 Accessability of facility/hours open
- 6.4 Pleasant and positive learning environment within facility

7.0 OUT OF HOUSE

- 7.1 Needs assessment
- 7.2 PR/Advertising
- 7.3 Programs/Services
- 7.4 Referral
- 7.5 Political support

Summative evaluation

The last section of the Clymer-Walvekar evaluation checklist addresses summative evaluation concerns:

8.0 OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAM

- 8.1 Documentation
- 8.2 Methods of data collection
- 8.3 Achievement of goals
- 8.4 Revision after evaluation

(Clymer-Walvekar: in press)

Appendix C

from: Improving Student Learning Skills Martha Maxwell Jossey-Bass San Francisco 1979.

Table 1. Purposes and General Methods of Program Evaluation

	Experimental Study	*Quasi-Experimental Study*	*Correlational Status Study*	*Survey*	*Personnel or Student Assessment*	*Systematic "Expert" Judgments*	*Clinical or Case Study*	*Informal Observation and/or Testimony*
X Likely investigation method								
I. To contribute to decisions about program installation								
A. Need								
1. Frequency								
a. Student				X	X	X		
b. Society				X		X		X
c. Other (for example, industrial, professional, governmental)				X	X	X		X
2. Intensity								
a. Student				X	X	X	X	X
b. Society				X		X	X	X
c. Other				X	X	X	X	X
B. Program conception								
1. Appropriateness						X		
2. Quality						X		
3. Priority in the face of competing needs						X		
C. Estimated cost								
1. Absolute cost				X		X		
2. Cost in relation to alternative strategies oriented toward same need				X		X		
D. Operational feasibility								
1. Staff				X	X	X		X
2. Materials				X		X		X
3. Facilities				X		X		X
4. Schedule						X		
E. Projection of demand and support								
1. Popular				X		X		X
2. Political/financial				X		X		X
3. Professional				X		X		X
II. To contribute to decisions about program continuation, expansion, and/or "accreditation"								
A. Continuing need								
1. Frequency								
a. Student				X	X	X		
b. Society				X		X		X
c. Other				X	X	X		X
2. Intensity								
a. Student				X	X	X	X	X
b. Society				X		X	X	X
c. Other				X	X	X	X	X
B. Global effectiveness in meeting need								
1. Short-term	X	X						
2. Long-term	X	X						
C. Minimal negative side effects	X	X					X	
D. Important positive side effects	X	X					X	

Table 1. Purposes and General Methods of Program Evaluation (Continued)

	Experimental Study	Quasi-Experimental Study	Correlational Status Study	Survey	Personnel or Student Assessment	Systematic "Expert" Judgments	Clinical or Case Study	Informal Observation and/or Testimony
E. Cost								
1. Absolute cost				X				
2. Cost in relation to alternative strategies oriented toward same need				X				
3. Cost in relation to benefits			X					
F. Demand and support								
1. Popular				X				X
2. Political/financial				X		X		X
3. Professional				X		X		X
III. To contribute to decisions about program modification								
A. Program objectives								
1. Validity and utility (in meeting needs)						X		
2. Popular acceptance				X				X
3. Professional acceptance				X		X		X
4. Student acceptance				X				X
5. Instructor acceptance				X		X		X
B. Curriculum content								
1. Relevance to program objectives						X		
2. Coverage of objectives						X		
3. Technical accuracy						X		
4. Degree of structure						X		
5. Relevance to backgrounds of students				X		X		
6. Effectiveness of components	X	X						
7. Sequencing of components	X	X				X		
8. Difficulty				X		X		
9. Popular acceptance				X				X
10. Professional acceptance				X		X		X
11. Student acceptance				X				X
12. Instructor acceptance				X		X		X
C. Instructional methodology								
1. Degree of student autonomy						X		
2. Effectiveness of presentation methods	X	X						
3. Pacing and length	X	X				X		
4. Reinforcement system	X	X						
5. Student acceptance				X				X
6. Instructor acceptance				X		X		X
D. Program context								
1. Administrative structure, auspices						X		X
2. Program administration procedures						X		X
3. Staff roles and relationships				X		X	X	X
4. Public relations efforts				X		X		X
5. Physical facilities and plant						X		X
6. Fiscal sources and stability						X		
7. Fiscal administration procedures						X		

Table 1. Purposes and General Methods of Program Evaluation (Continued)

	Experimental Study	Quasi-Experimental Study	Correlational Status Study	Survey	Personnel or Student Assessment	Systematic "Expert" Judgments	Clinical or Case Study	Informal Observation and/or Testimony
E. Personnel policies and practices								
1. Students								
a. Recruitment				X	X	X		
b. Selection and placement	X	X	X		X			
c. Evaluation			X	X				
d. Discipline			X	X		X	X	X
e. Retention			X		X			
2. Instructors								
a. Selection and placement		X	X		X			
b. In-service training		X	X	X		X		
c. Evaluation for promotion, guidance, retention, etc.			X	X				
3. Administrators								
a. Selection			X		X	X		
b. Evaluation for promotion, retention, etc.			X			X		
IV. To obtain evidence favoring program to rally support								
A. Popular	X	X		X	X	X		X
B. Political/financial	X	X		X	X	X		
C. Professional	X	X				X		
V. To obtain evidence against program to rally opposition								
A. Popular	X	X		X	X	X		X
B. Political/financial	X	X		X	X	X		
C. Professional	X	X				X		
VI. To contribute to the understanding of basic processes								
A. Educational	X	X	X				X	
B. Psychological	X	X	X				X	
C. Social	X	X	X					
D. Economic	X	X	X					
E. Evaluation (Methodology)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
8118 MATH-SCIENCES BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36

MAR 25 1983